

The LU-LC conjecture, diagonal local operations and quadratic forms over $\text{GF}(2)$

David Gross^{*†} and Maarten Van den Nest[‡]

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We report progress on the LU-LC conjecture—an open problem in the context of entanglement in stabilizer states (or graph states). This conjecture states that every two stabilizer states which are related by a local unitary operation, must also be related by a local operation within the Clifford group. The contribution of this paper is a reduction of the LU-LC conjecture to a simpler problem—which, however, remains to date unsolved. As our main result, we show that, if the LU-LC conjecture could be proved for the restricted case of *diagonal* local unitary operations, then the conjecture is correct in its totality. Furthermore, the reduced version of the problem, involving such diagonal local operations, is mapped to questions regarding quadratic forms over the finite field $\text{GF}(2)$. Finally, we prove that correctness of the LU-LC conjecture for stabilizer states implies a similar result for the more general case of stabilizer codes.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Stabilizer states and codes, and local equivalence	5
2.1	Stabilizer states and codes	5
2.2	Local equivalence	7

^{*}Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Imperial College London, Prince's Gate, London SW7 2PG, UK.

[†]QOLS, Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College London, Prince Consort Road, London SW7 2BW, UK.

[‡]Institut für Quantenoptik und Quanteninformation der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Innsbruck, Austria.

3	From LU to diagonal LU operations	8
3.1	Preliminary results	8
3.2	Semi-Clifford operations	11
3.3	Diagonal LU operations	13
4	From diagonal LU operations to quadratic forms over $\text{GF}(2)$	13
5	From stabilizer codes to stabilizer states	17
5.1	Preliminaries	18
5.2	Reduction to stabilizer states	20
6	Outlook	22
7	Acknowledgements	22

1 Introduction

Stabilizer states—or, equivalently, graph states—are special instances of multi-party quantum states that are of interest in a number of domains in quantum information theory and quantum computation. Stabilizer states are defined in terms of the stabilizer formalism, which is a group-theoretic framework originally designed in the 1990s to construct broad classes of quantum error-correcting codes—the *stabilizer codes* [1]. In addition to their role in quantum error-correction, in recent years stabilizer states have been considered in a number of interesting applications, where the measurement-based model of quantum computation known as the *one-way quantum computer* is certainly among the most prominent [2, 3]. We refer to Ref. [4] for a recent overview article about stabilizer states and their applications.

It is well known that many stabilizer states exhibit a high degree of genuine multi-party entanglement [4], and that this entanglement is a key ingredient responsible for the successful use of these states in various applications. Therefore, a detailed study of the entanglement properties of stabilizer states is of natural interest. Recently, a number of authors have studied this topic with considerable success (for an incomplete list, see Refs. [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18]), and also the present paper is situated in this context.

The study of the nonlocal properties of stabilizer states naturally leads to an investigation of the action of local unitary (LU) operations on stabilizer states, and a classification of stabilizer states under LU equivalence. In this context, an important role is played by a subclass of LU operations known as *local Clifford* (LC) operations, which are defined to be those LU operations mapping the Pauli group to itself under conjugation. Due to the close connection between the Pauli group, the

stabilizer formalism and the (local) Clifford group, the action of LC operations on stabilizer states can be described efficiently and in a transparent manner, allowing for a thorough understanding of the entanglement in stabilizer states with respect to this restricted LC symmetry. For example, the action of LC operations on graph states can entirely be understood in terms of a single elementary graph transformation rule [8]. Moreover, a systematic classification of LC equivalence of stabilizer states is possible and has been executed up to $n = 12$ qubits [5, 13]. Finally, an efficient algorithm (i.e., with polynomial time complexity in the number of qubits) to decide whether two given stabilizer states are LC equivalent, is known [9].

In the study of LU equivalence of stabilizer states, it is natural to ask whether the restriction to LC equivalence is in fact a restriction at all. This is the content of the “LU-LC conjecture”, which states that “*Every two LU equivalent stabilizer states must also be LC equivalent*”. The conjecture, which will be the central topic of this paper, has been listed as the 28th open problem in quantum information theory [19]. The main implication of a proof of the LU-LC conjecture would be that questions regarding entanglement of stabilizer states can entirely be treated within the closed framework of stabilizer formalism plus local Clifford group. In particular, the aforementioned insights into the restricted regime of LC equivalence would then count as insights regarding the “true” local unitary symmetry. Even more so, in previous work it was shown that the notions of LU equivalence and equivalence under stochastic local operations and classical communication (in short: *SLOCC equivalence*) coincide for all stabilizer states [20]. Therefore, correctness of the LU-LC conjecture would imply that both of these symmetries would be reduced to the tractable case of LC equivalence.

The LU-LC conjecture has been studied considerably in recent years. The most recent progress involved proofs that LU and LC equivalence indeed coincide for large subclasses of stabilizer states [12, 16], but a complete proof of the conjecture remained—and remains—out of reach. In this work, we report further significant advances. Because the argument will be technical, at this point we give a brief outline of the results.

The pivotal conjecture is the following:

Conjecture 1. (LU-LC conjecture) *Every two LU equivalent stabilizer states are also LC equivalent.*

It is the aim of this work to reduce the LU-LC conjecture to a simpler problem¹. This reduction will take place in a number of steps. First, a central finding in the present paper will be that only a very restricted class of LU operations has the

¹Note that this approach is different from the one adopted in e.g. Refs. [12, 16], where one aims at constructing as-large-as-possible subclasses of stabilizer states for which the conjecture holds.

capability of mapping a stabilizer state to another stabilizer state. The following theorem was first proved in one of the authors' diploma thesis [11]. In this paper, we present a more direct argument. [After this work had been completed, B. Zeng pointed out to us that the same statement had been obtained independently in Ref. [21].]

Theorem 1. (Reduction to diagonal unitaries) *Let $U = U_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes U_n$ be an LU operation, and suppose that there exist stabilizer states $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\psi'\rangle$ such that $U|\psi\rangle = |\psi'\rangle$. Then, up to the action of Clifford operations, all U_i are diagonal matrices.*

More precisely, every one-qubit operator U_i has the form $U_i = C_i D_i C'_i$, where C_i and C'_i are Clifford and D_i is diagonal.

This result immediately implies that the LU-LC conjecture is equivalent to the following simpler problem: “Every two stabilizer states that are related by a *diagonal* LU operator, are also LC equivalent”. This provides the first reduction of the LU-LC conjecture: only diagonal LU operations need to be considered. Note that a diagonal unitary operator on a single qubit has the form $\text{diag}(1, e^{i\phi})$ and therefore depends only on one real parameter. This is a significant reduction in complexity w.r.t. to the case of general $SU(2)$ operators, which depend on three parameters. Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.

In Section 4, we will show that the remaining problem is related to a certain statement about quadratic forms and linear spaces over the finite field of order two (which will be denoted by $\text{GF}(2)$ or, equivalently, $\mathbb{F}_2$). The following result will be obtained.

Theorem 2. (Reduction to quadratic forms) *Let S be a linear subspace of $\mathbb{F}_2^n$, and let $Q : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ be a quadratic function. Suppose that there exist complex phases $\{c_i\}$, such that*

$$(-1)^{Q(x)} = \prod_{i=1}^n c_i^{x_i}, \quad \text{for every } x \in S. \quad (1)$$

If, for every such Q and S , the phases can always be chosen from $\{\pm 1, \pm i\}$, then the LU-LC conjecture is true.

The criterion in the preceding theorem is not only sufficient for the LU-LC conjecture, but—up to a sensible extra assumption—also necessary. Hence, essentially, the pertinent question reduces to a problem concerning binary quadratic forms—note that there is no mentioning about stabilizer states or local unitary operations in the formulation (1). Remarkably, the LU-LC problem remains hard

even in this considerably simplified guise, and a proof (or counterexample) has to date not been found.

As a final result in this paper, in Section 5 we will prove that correctness of the LU-LC conjecture for stabilizer states would imply a similar LU-LC theorem regarding the more general case of stabilizer *codes*—recall that stabilizer states are a specific instance of stabilizer codes (they form the class of one-dimensional codes). The following result will be proven:

Theorem 3. (*Reduction from codes to states*) *The LU-LC conjecture holds for all stabilizer codes if and only if it holds for stabilizer states.*

Therefore, in conjunction with theorems 1 and 2, this result implies that the general LU-LC conjecture for stabilizer codes is reduced to the problem regarding quadratic forms over $\text{GF}(2)$ as posed in Eq. (1).

2 Stabilizer states and codes, and local equivalence

In this section we fix some notations, state basic definitions, and recall some preliminary results which will be needed in the following. For more details, we refer the reader to Refs. [1, 22].

2.1 Stabilizer states and codes

The $2^n \times 2^n$ identity matrix is denoted by I_n , for every $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$. The n -qubit Hilbert space is $\mathcal{H}_n \cong \mathbb{C}^{2^n}$.

The Pauli group $\mathcal{G}_1$ on one qubit is the multiplicative subgroup of $U(2)$ generated by the Pauli matrices

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, Y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix}, Z = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

Note that the Pauli matrices X , Y and Z are Hermitian and unitary operators with zero trace. The Pauli group $\mathcal{G}_n$ on n qubits is the n -fold tensor product of $\mathcal{G}_1$ with itself. For an arbitrary n -qubit Pauli operator $g \in \mathcal{G}_n$, we let $g_1, \dots, g_n \in \{I, X, Y, Z\}$, written with *lower* indices, denote the unique one-qubit Pauli operators such that $g \propto g_1 \otimes \dots \otimes g_n$. Here $\propto$ denotes equality up to a global phase factor. The *support* of an n -qubit Pauli operator g is the set

$$\text{supp}(g) = \{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid g_i \neq I_1\}. \quad (3)$$

The operator g is said to have *full support* if $\text{supp}(g) = \{1, \dots, n\}$. We will use the shorthand notations

$$Z(t) := \bigotimes_{i=1}^n Z^{t_i} \quad \text{and} \quad X(t) := \bigotimes_{i=1}^n X^{t_i}, \quad (4)$$

for every $t = (t_1, \dots, t_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n$.

A *stabilizer* $\mathcal{S}$ on n qubits is defined to be an Abelian subgroup of $\mathcal{G}_n$ that does not contain $-I$. The following is a list of elementary properties of stabilizers, which can be found in the literature [1, 22].

- Every element g of a stabilizer $\mathcal{S}$ has the form $g = \pm g_1 \otimes \dots \otimes g_n$, where $g_i \in \{I, X, Y, Z\}$. It follows that stabilizer elements are always both Hermitian and unitary operators. In particular, one has $g^2 = I_n$.
- If $g \in \mathcal{S}$ then $-g \notin \mathcal{S}$.
- The trace of a stabilizer element different from the identity is equal to zero.
- The cardinality $|\mathcal{S}|$ of the stabilizer $\mathcal{S}$ is always a power of two not greater than 2^n . If $|\mathcal{S}| = 2^k$ then $\mathcal{S}$ is generated by k independent elements. The number k is then called the *rank* of $\mathcal{S}$.

The *stabilizer code* associated to an n -qubit stabilizer $\mathcal{S}$ is the subspace $V_{\mathcal{S}} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_n$ consisting of all simultaneous fixed points of the elements of $\mathcal{S}$, i.e.,

$$V_{\mathcal{S}} := \{|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_n \mid g|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle \text{ for every } g \in \mathcal{S}\}. \quad (5)$$

The dimension of $V_{\mathcal{S}}$ is equal to $2^{n-|\mathcal{S}|}$, which is a power of two. The stabilizer code $V_{\mathcal{S}}$ is identified with the operator

$$\rho := \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{S}} g, \quad (6)$$

which is, up to a multiplicative constant, equal to the orthogonal projector on the code $V_{\mathcal{S}}$. The normalization is chosen such as to yield $\text{Tr}(\rho) = 1$.

If $\mathcal{S}$ is an n -qubit stabilizer with cardinality $|\mathcal{S}| = 2^n$, the code $V_{\mathcal{S}}$ is one-dimensional, or, equivalently, the associated projector ρ has rank one and is therefore of the form

$$\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \quad (7)$$

for some $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_n$. The class of pure states $|\psi\rangle$ that are obtained in this way are called *stabilizer states*. Thus, a stabilizer state on n qubits is any state $|\psi\rangle$ having the property that $g|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$ for every element g in a maximal stabilizer $\mathcal{S}$, i.e., where $|\mathcal{S}| = 2^n$. We refer to Ref. [4] for a recent review of stabilizer states and their properties.

2.2 Local equivalence

We now introduce the notions of local equivalence of stabilizer states and codes that we will study in the following.

LU equivalence.— Two stabilizer codes² ρ and ρ' are called LU equivalent if there exists a local unitary operator $U \in U(2)^{\otimes n}$ such that $U\rho U^\dagger = \rho'$.

LC equivalence.— A 2×2 unitary operator U is called a *Clifford operator*³ on one qubit if $U\sigma U^\dagger \in \mathcal{G}_1$ for every Pauli matrix $\sigma \in \{X, Y, Z\}$. The set of all Clifford operations forms a matrix group called the Clifford group. It can be shown that the Clifford group is generated by the the matrices

$$cI_1, \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{bmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where c ranges over all complex phases. Note that the Pauli matrices X , Y and Z are instances of Clifford operations. A *local Clifford operator* (LC operator) on n qubits is a local unitary operator $U = U_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes U_n$, where every tensor factor U_i is a Clifford operator. Two stabilizer codes are called LC equivalent if there exists an LC operator U relating the two codes under conjugation.

Semi-Clifford operations.— An important ingredient in the following will be a third kind of local operations, namely the *local semi-Clifford operations*, which are defined next. A 2×2 unitary operator U is called a *semi-Clifford operator* on one qubit if there exist a Pauli matrix $\sigma \in \{X, Y, Z\}$ such that $U\sigma U^\dagger \in \mathcal{G}_1$. Thus, a semi-Clifford operator is defined to send *at least one* of the Pauli matrices to another Pauli matrix under conjugation (up to a global phase factor). As an example, the diagonal matrix

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & c \end{bmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where c is an arbitrary complex phase, is a semi-Clifford operator for all c , since $DZD^\dagger = Z$. However, D is only a Clifford operation if $c \in \{\pm 1, \pm i\}$. It is clear that every Clifford operator is also a semi-Clifford. We then define a *local semi-Clifford operator* on n qubits to be a local unitary operator $U = U_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes U_n$, where every tensor factor U_i is a semi-Clifford operator.

²In this and the following definitions in this section, we consider stabilizer states as one-dimensional instances of stabilizer codes, $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$.

³ Note that the group of Clifford operators which appears in quantum information theory has nothing to do with either Clifford algebras or the Clifford group used e.g. in the context of Fermionic systems or the representation theory of $SO(n)$.

3 From LU to diagonal LU operations

In this section we show that there exist severe restrictions on the LU operators which can realize local transformations between stabilizer codes (or states). In particular, we will prove that *any LU operator mapping a stabilizer code (or state) to another one must be a semi-Clifford operation*. We will subsequently use this result to show that, in the study of the LU-LC conjecture, one can—without loss of generality—restrict attention to local equivalence of stabilizer states and codes with respect to *diagonal* LU operations only, i.e., LU operations of the form

$$U = c \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \\ & c_1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \cdots \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \\ & c_n \end{bmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

where $c, c_1, \dots, c_n$ are complex phases. Hence, the complexity of the LU operations which need to be considered in the study of the LU-LC conjecture is drastically reduced.

In Section 3.1 some preliminary results are proven. In Section 3.2 we show that any LU operator mapping a stabilizer code (or state) to another one is necessarily a semi-Clifford operation. Finally, in Section 3.3 we show that this allows one to restrict attention to diagonal LU operations in the study of the LU-LC conjecture.

3.1 Preliminary results

Below, the following type of stabilizer codes will play a role. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. A $[2m, 2m - 2, 2]$ stabilizer code is a code with stabilizer of the form

$$\mathcal{S} = \{I_{2m}, g, g', gg'\}, \quad (11)$$

where g, g' and gg' are Pauli operators having full support. Every $[2m, 2m - 2, 2]$ code is LU equivalent to the code $\rho^{[2m, 2m-2, 2]}$ defined by

$$\rho^{[2m, 2m-2, 2]} := \frac{1}{4^m} (I_{2m} + X^{\otimes 2m} + (-1)^m Y^{\otimes 2m} + Z^{\otimes 2m}). \quad (12)$$

The operator $\rho^{[2, 0, 2]}$ has rank one, and is therefore a stabilizer state. Concretely, one has $\rho^{[2, 0, 2]} = |\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+|$, where $|\psi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$ is the EPR state. The following result was proven in Ref. [23] and will be an important part of our analysis.

Proposition 1. [23] *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $m \geq 2$. Let ρ and ρ' be two $[2m, 2m - 2, 2]$ stabilizer codes and let $U \in U(2)^{\otimes n}$ be an LU operator such that $U\rho U^\dagger = \rho'$. Then U is an LC operator.*

For every subgroup $\mathcal{T}$ of $\mathcal{S}$, the *index* of $\mathcal{T}$ in $\mathcal{S}$ is defined to be the number $[\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{T}] := |\mathcal{S}|/|\mathcal{T}|^{-1}$. Note that $|\mathcal{S}|$ is a power of two, and therefore $|\mathcal{T}|$ and $[\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{T}]$ are also powers of two. For every $i = 1, \dots, n$, define $\mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle := \{g \in \mathcal{S} \mid g_i = I_1\}$. It is easily verified that $\mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle$ is a subgroup of $\mathcal{S}$. We will need the following lemmas.

Lemma 1. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a stabilizer on n qubits. Then $[\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle] \in \{1, 2, 4\}$, for every $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

Proof: the proof uses elementary group theory. We start from the property that $\mathcal{S}$ can be partitioned into cosets of the subgroup $\mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle$:

$$\mathcal{S} = g^{(1)}\mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle \cup \dots \cup g^{(N)}\mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle, \quad (13)$$

for some Pauli operators $g^{(1)} = I_n, g^{(2)}, \dots, g^{(N)} \in \mathcal{S}$, where

$$g^{(j)}\mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle \cap g^{(k)}\mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle = \emptyset \quad (14)$$

for every $j, k = 1, \dots, N$ with $j \neq k$. The number of cosets N is equal to $[\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle]$. Note that two elements $g, g' \in \mathcal{S}$ belong to different cosets of $\mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle$ if and only if $g_i \neq g'_i$, showing that there can be at most 4 cosets, as $g_i \in \{I_1, X, Y, Z\}$. Since $[\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle]$ is a power of two, the result follows. $\square$

Lemma 2. *Let ρ be an n -qubit stabilizer code with stabilizer $\mathcal{S}$, and let $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$. Then the quantities $|\mathcal{S}|$, $|\mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle|$, and $[\mathcal{S}' : \mathcal{S}'\langle i \rangle]$ are local unitary invariants.*

Proof: we have seen in Section 2.1 that the rank of ρ is equal to $2^n|\mathcal{S}|^{-1}$. As the rank of a density operator is an LU invariant, this shows that $|\mathcal{S}|$ is an LU invariant. Second, it was proven in Ref. [12] that the quantities $|\mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle|$ are LU invariants. It then immediately follows that the quantities $[\mathcal{S}' : \mathcal{S}'\langle i \rangle]$ are LU invariants as well. $\square$

Lemma 3. *Let ρ and ρ' be LU equivalent stabilizer codes with stabilizers $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}'$, respectively. Let $U = U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_n \in U(2)^{\otimes n}$ such that $U\rho U^\dagger = \rho'$. Then U_i is semi-Clifford for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ for which $[\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle] = 2$.*

Proof: Let $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ such that $[\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle] = 2$. Since ρ and ρ' are locally equivalent, we also have $[\mathcal{S}' : \mathcal{S}'\langle i \rangle] = 2$ from Lemma 2. Therefore, we can partition $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}'$ in cosets as follows: $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle \cup g\mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle$ and $\mathcal{S}' = \mathcal{S}'\langle i \rangle \cup g'\mathcal{S}'\langle i \rangle$, where $g \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle$ and $g' \in \mathcal{S}' \setminus \mathcal{S}'\langle i \rangle$. Defining $\rho\langle i \rangle = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{h \in \mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle} h$ and $\rho'\langle i \rangle$ similarly, it follows from the definitions of ρ and ρ' that

$$\rho = (I_n + g)\rho\langle i \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \rho' = (I_n + g')\rho'\langle i \rangle. \quad (15)$$

Note that

$$\rho\langle i \rangle = \text{Tr}_i(\rho) \otimes \frac{I_1}{2} \text{ and } \rho'\langle i \rangle = \text{Tr}_i(\rho') \otimes \frac{I_1}{2}. \quad (16)$$

This property essentially follows from the fact that, in taking the partial trace over the i th qubit, the only Pauli operators in the expansion (6) which survive the partial trace are those having an i th tensor factor equal to the identity.

Using the identity $U\rho U^\dagger = \rho'$ and (16), we have $U\rho\langle i \rangle U^\dagger = \rho'\langle i \rangle$. It then follows from (15) that $(UgU^\dagger)\rho'\langle i \rangle = g'\rho'\langle i \rangle$. The r.h.s. of this equation is a sum of Pauli operators all having the same i th tensor factor, namely g'_i . Therefore, the l.h.s. must also have this property, and this can only occur if $U_i g_i U_i^\dagger \propto g'_i$. Since $g_i \neq I_1 \neq g'_i$, this shows that U_i is semi-Clifford. $\square$

Lemma 4. *Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a stabilizer on n qubits and let Π be the smallest subgroup of $\mathcal{S}$ containing all subgroups $\mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle$, i.e.,*

$$\Pi = \left\{ g^{(1)}g^{(2)} \dots g^{(n)} \mid g^{(i)} \in \mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle, i = 1, \dots, n \right\}. \quad (17)$$

Then one of the following three cases occurs:

- (i) $\Pi = \mathcal{S}$;
- (ii) $[\mathcal{S} : \Pi] = 2$;
- (iii) $[\mathcal{S} : \Pi] = 4$; in this case, the associated code must be a $[2m, 2m - 2, 2]$ code.

Proof: Since Π is a subgroup of $\mathcal{S}$, $[\mathcal{S} : \Pi]$ is a power of two. Furthermore, each $\mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle$ is a subgroup of Π and therefore $[\mathcal{S} : \Pi] \leq [\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle] \leq 4$, for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. This shows that $[\mathcal{S} : \Pi] \in \{1, 2, 4\}$. We investigate these possibilities case by case. First, if $[\mathcal{S} : \Pi] = 1$ then $\Pi = \mathcal{S}$ trivially, which proves (i).

We now prove (iii). If $[\mathcal{S} : \Pi] = 4$ then $\mathcal{S}$ can be partitioned in cosets as follows:

$$\mathcal{S} = \Pi \cup g^{(1)}\Pi \cup g^{(2)}\Pi \cup g^{(3)}\Pi, \quad (18)$$

for suitable $g^{(j)} \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \Pi$. The $g^{(j)}$ must have full support and must pairwise differ on every qubit. For, suppose there is a qubit i such that, say, $g_i^{(1)} = g_i^{(2)}$. Then $g^{(1)}g^{(2)} \in \Pi$, implying that $g^{(1)}\Pi = g^{(2)}\Pi$, which contradicts the definition of the $g^{(j)}$. A similar argument can be given for arbitrary pairs $g^{(j)}$ and $g^{(k)}$. This shows that the $g^{(j)}$ s must pairwise differ on every qubit.

Next, let f be an arbitrary element of Π . We prove that f must be equal to the identity by contradiction: suppose there is a qubit i such that $f_i \neq I_1$, then there exists a $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ such that $f_i = g_i^{(j)}$. But this implies that

$$g^{(j)} = \underbrace{f}_{\in \Pi} \underbrace{(fg^{(j)})}_{\in \Pi} \in \Pi \quad (19)$$

which is a contradiction. Hence $f = I_n$, so $\Pi = \{I_n\}$ and $|S| = 4$. But then $S = \{g^{(1)}, g^{(2)}, g^{(3)}, I_n\}$, proving the claim. $\square$

3.2 Semi-Clifford operations

We are now in a position to prove the main results of this section. Defining the *support*⁴ of a stabilizer S to be the set $\text{supp}(S) := \bigcup_{g \in S} \text{supp}(g)$, we can precisely formulate the main result of this section.

Theorem 4. *Let ρ and ρ' be LU equivalent stabilizer codes with stabilizers S and S' on $n \geq 2$ qubits, and suppose that ρ cannot be written as a product of the form*

$$|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| \otimes \rho'', \quad (20)$$

where $|\psi\rangle$ is a 2-qubit stabilizer state LU equivalent to the EPR state and ρ'' is a stabilizer code on $n - 2$ qubits. Let $U = U_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes U_n \in U(2)^{\otimes n}$ such that $U\rho U^\dagger = \rho'$. Then U_i is semi-Clifford for every $i \in \text{supp}(S)$.

Proof: We prove the result by induction on n . If $n = 2$, up to local equivalence plus permutations of the 2 qubits the following stabilizer codes ρ fulfilling the requirement of the theorem exist:

$$4\rho = \begin{cases} I_2 \\ I_2 + Z \otimes Z \\ I_2 + I_1 \otimes Z \\ I_2 + I_1 \otimes Z + Z \otimes I_1 + Z \otimes Z \end{cases}. \quad (21)$$

It is straightforward to verify that the claim holds for these codes.

In the induction step of the proof, fix $n \geq 3$ and suppose the result has been verified for all $n' < n$. Let ρ and ρ' be locally equivalent stabilizer codes on $n \geq 3$

⁴This definition is introduced for technical reasons. If the support of a stabilizer on n qubits is strictly contained within the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$, then the associated code can be written as the product of a code on fewer qubits and the identity matrix. Therefore, for any reasonable application it makes no sense to consider stabilizers not having full support. This definition is however introduced here to facilitate the induction argument made in the proof of Theorem 4.

qubits satisfying the requirement of the theorem, and let $U = U_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes U_n \in U(2)^{\otimes n}$ such that $U\rho U^\dagger = \rho'$. It follows that

$$U[i] \text{Tr}_i(\rho) U[i]^\dagger = \text{Tr}_i(\rho') \quad (22)$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, where we have defined

$$U[i] := U_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes U_{i-1} \otimes U_{i+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes U_n. \quad (23)$$

Note that $\text{Tr}_i(\rho)$ and $\text{Tr}_i(\rho')$ are stabilizer codes on $n - 1$ qubits, and that $\text{Tr}_i(\rho)$ cannot be written as a product in the form of (20). We can therefore apply the induction hypotheses to every pair $\text{Tr}_i(\rho)$ and $\text{Tr}_i(\rho')$, where $i = 1, \dots, n$. This proves that U_j is semi-Clifford for every j in the set

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^n \text{supp } \mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle. \quad (24)$$

Now, if the set (24) is equal to $\text{supp}(\mathcal{S})$ then we are done. If this is not the case, then there exist $j \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{S})$ such that $j \notin \text{supp}(\mathcal{S}\langle i \rangle)$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$, and hence $j \notin \text{supp}(\Pi)$, where Π is defined as in Lemma 4. This last property implies that $\Pi \neq \mathcal{S}$, and therefore case (ii) or case (iii) in Lemma 4 must apply.

If case (ii) holds, the stabilizer $\mathcal{S}$ can be written as a partition

$$\mathcal{S} = \Pi \cup g\Pi, \quad (25)$$

where $g \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \Pi$, and therefore g has full support. Expression (25) together with the property that $j \notin \text{supp}(\Pi)$ implies that $h_j \in \{I_1, g_j\}$ for every $h \in \mathcal{S}$, and thus $[\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{S}\langle j \rangle] = 2$. Lemma 3 then shows that U_j must be a semi-Clifford operation.

In the event of case (iii), ρ and ρ' must be $[2m, 2m - 2, 2]$ codes with $m \neq 1$, and proposition 1 then implies that U is a local Clifford operation, which is a fortiori local semi-Clifford. This proves the result. $\square$

As an immediate corollary of this result, we find:

Corollary 1. *Let $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\psi'\rangle$ be fully entangled, LU equivalent stabilizer states on $n \geq 3$ qubits, and let $U \in U(2)^{\otimes n}$ be an LU operator such that $U|\psi\rangle = |\psi'\rangle$. Then U is a local semi-Clifford operator.*

Proof: letting $\mathcal{S}$ be the stabilizer of $|\psi\rangle$, it is clear that $\mathcal{S}$ has full support. Moreover, $|\psi\rangle$ is a fully entangled state on $n \geq 3$ qubits and therefore satisfies the requirements of Theorem 4. The result follows immediately. $\square$

From this point on, we will only consider fully entangled stabilizer states on $n \geq 3$ qubits. Note that the restriction to fully entangled states does not entail a loss of generality.

3.3 Diagonal LU operations

Let $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\psi'\rangle$ be stabilizer states on n qubits and let $U = U_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes U_n$ be an LU operator such that $U|\psi\rangle = |\psi'\rangle$. According to corollary 1, U must be a local semi-Clifford operation. By definition, this means that there exist n Pauli matrices $\sigma_i \in \{X, Y, Z\}$ such that $U_i \sigma_i U_i^\dagger \in \mathcal{G}_1$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. It is then easy to verify that there exist LC operators $V = V_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes V_n$ and $V' = V'_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes V'_n$ such that

$$\left(V'_i U_i V_i^\dagger\right) Z \left(V'_i U_i V_i^\dagger\right)^\dagger = Z \quad (26)$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. Defining

$$\begin{aligned} D_i &:= V'_i U_i V_i^\dagger \quad (i = 1, \dots, n), \\ D &:= D_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes D_n, \\ |\phi\rangle &:= V|\psi\rangle \\ |\phi'\rangle &:= V'|\psi\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

it follows that $D|\phi\rangle = |\phi'\rangle$. Note that (26) is equivalent to $[D_i, Z] = 0$ and therefore every D_i is a diagonal unitary matrix. The operator D will be called a DLU operator (on n qubits), short for *diagonal local unitary*. We thus have:

Corollary 2. Assume $U = U_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes U_n$ maps a stabilizer state to a stabilizer state. Then, up to the action of local Clifford operations, all U_i are diagonal matrices.

Corollary 3. (Reduction to diagonal unitaries) The LU-LC conjecture holds if and only if any two stabilizer states that can be mapped onto each other by means of a diagonal local unitary, are LC equivalent.

4 From diagonal LU operations to quadratic forms over $\mathbb{GF}(2)$

Letting $|\psi\rangle$ be an arbitrary stabilizer state, we consider the expansion

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n} \langle x | \psi \rangle \cdot |x\rangle \quad (28)$$

in the computational basis. We have used the standard shorthand notation $|x\rangle = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n |x_i\rangle$, for every $x \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$. In this section we will consider the connection between the components $\langle x | \psi \rangle$ of a stabilizer state and quadratic forms over $\mathbb{F}_2$. First we introduce some definitions.

Let $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. A function $q : \mathbb{F}_2^m \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ is called a quadratic form if there exist coefficients $\theta_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}_2$ ($i, j = 1, \dots, m, i < j$) and a vector $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}_2^m$ such that

$$q(x) = \sum_{i < j} \theta_{ij} x_i x_j + \lambda^T x \quad (29)$$

for every $x = (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \mathbb{F}_2^m$. The first term in the r.h.s. of (29) is called the quadratic part of the representation of q and the second term is called its linear part.

We also need some definitions regarding affine spaces over $\mathbb{F}_2$. Let S be a k -dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{F}_2^n$. Letting t be a vector in $\mathbb{F}_2^n$, the *affine space* with *directional vector space* S and *base point* t is the set

$$S + t := \{y + t \mid y \in S\}. \quad (30)$$

We can now state the connection between quadratic forms and stabilizer states by recalling the following result of Ref. [24].

Theorem 5. [24] *Let $|\psi\rangle$ be a stabilizer state on n qubits. Then there exist*

- (i) *a linear subspace S of $\mathbb{F}_2^n$,*
- (ii) *a quadratic form $q : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$, and*
- (iii) *vectors $d, t \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$,*

such that

$$2^{k/2} \cdot \langle x | \psi \rangle = \begin{cases} i^{d^T y} (-1)^{q(y)} & \text{for every } x = y + t \text{ with } y \in S \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

where the algebra in the exponent of the complex number i is to be performed over $\mathbb{F}_2$ (i.e., modulo 2). Conversely, every state $|\psi\rangle$ with components $\langle x | \psi \rangle$ satisfying the above conditions, is a stabilizer state.

Qualitatively, this result states that, first, the nonzero components $\langle x | \psi \rangle$ can only be equal to ± 1 or $\pm i$ (up to an overall normalization); second, the distribution of the ± 1 's and $\pm i$'s is governed by quadratic and linear forms, respectively; third, the nonzero components $\langle x | \psi \rangle$ are organized in such a way that the corresponding vectors x lie in an affine subspace $S + t$ of $\mathbb{F}_2^n$.

The following lemma shows that only S and q are essential to the problem at hand. Anticipating this result, we say that a stabilizer state is *in standard form* if the parameters d and t vanish.

Lemma 5. (Reduction to $t = d = 0$) *The LU-LC conjecture is true for general stabilizer states if and only if any two DLU-equivalent stabilizer states in standard form are also LC equivalent.*

Proof: The “only if” part is trivial. To prove the “if” direction, assume that any two DLU-equivalent stabilizer states in standard form are also LC equivalent.

Let $|\psi\rangle, |\psi'\rangle$ be general stabilizer states and let D be a local unitary s.t. $D|\psi\rangle = |\psi'\rangle$. By Corollary 3, we can assume that D is diagonal. Let t, d, S and t', d', S' be the parameters associated to $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\psi'\rangle$ respectively. Note that $S = S'$ and $t = t'$ as D is diagonal. In particular, one has

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{|S|^{1/2}} \sum_{y \in S} i^{d^T y} (-1)^{q(y)} |y + t\rangle. \quad (32)$$

Set $X(t) = X^{t_1} \otimes \dots \otimes X^{t_n}$ and likewise $T^\dagger(d) = (T^\dagger)^{d_1} \otimes \dots \otimes (T^\dagger)^{d_n}$, where $T = \text{diag}(1, i)$ is the phase gate. One then finds that

$$|\psi\rangle_{\text{SF}} := T^\dagger(d) X(t) |\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{|S|^{1/2}} \sum_{y \in S} (-1)^{\tilde{q}(y)} |y\rangle, \quad (33)$$

where we have used the notation

$$\tilde{q}(y) = q(y) + \sum_{k < j} d_k y_k d_j y_j. \quad (34)$$

In order to prove (33), one uses that $i^a i^b = i^{a+b} (-1)^{ab}$ for every $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_2$, where the exponent of i is computed over $\mathbb{F}_2$. One therefore has

$$i^{d^T y} = \left\{ \prod_{j=1}^n i^{d_j y_j} \right\} (-1)^{\sum_{k < j} d_k y_k d_j y_j}. \quad (35)$$

Note that $|\psi\rangle_{\text{SF}}$ is in standard form. The same is true for $|\psi'\rangle_{\text{SF}} := T^\dagger(d') X(t) |\psi'\rangle$. As a consequence, the local unitary operator

$$D_{\text{SF}} = X(t) T(d') D T(d) X(t) \quad (36)$$

maps $|\psi\rangle_{\text{SF}}$ to $|\psi'\rangle_{\text{SF}}$. Because X sends diagonal operators to diagonal operators under conjugation, the standard form states are even DLU equivalent. Invoking the initial assumption, we conclude that D_{SF} can be substituted by an LC operation. As X and T are Clifford operations, this implies that D can be replaced by an LC operation. $\square$

Now assume that $|\psi\rangle$ is a stabilizer state. Let

$$D = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \\ & c_1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \cdots \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \\ & c_n \end{bmatrix} \quad (37)$$

be a DLU operation defined by the complex phases c_i . The operator D is Clifford if and only if all $c_i \in \{\pm 1, \pm i\}$. Suppose that $|\psi'\rangle := D|\psi\rangle$ is again a stabilizer state. In accordance with Lemma 5, we take $|\psi\rangle, |\psi'\rangle$ of the form

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle &= \frac{1}{|S|^{1/2}} \sum_{x \in S} (-1)^{q(x)} |x\rangle, \\ |\psi'\rangle &= \frac{1}{|S|^{1/2}} \sum_{x \in S} (-1)^{q'(x)} |x\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Evaluating the equation $\langle x | D | \psi \rangle = \langle x | \psi' \rangle$, we find for all $x \in S$

$$\prod_i c_i^{x_i} = (-1)^{q(x) + q'(x)} = (-1)^{Q(x)}, \quad (38)$$

where we have set $Q(x) = q(x) + q'(x)$. Note that $Q(x)$ is again a quadratic form and, conversely, every quadratic form can occur this way.

Equation (38) has an interesting structure. The l.h.s. of this equation has the structure of an exponentiated *complex linear form*; writing $c_j := e^{i\theta_j}$, one has

$$x \rightarrow e^{i(\theta_1 x_1 + \cdots + \theta_n x_n)}. \quad (39)$$

On the other hand, the r.h.s. of (38) is an exponentiated *quadratic form over GF(2)*:

$$x \rightarrow (-1)^{Q(x)}. \quad (40)$$

Can one use complex linear mappings to emulate the behavior of a quadratic form? If the vector space S is too large, this is clearly impossible. Assume, e.g., that e_i , the i th canonical basis vector of $\mathbb{F}_2^n$, is an element of S . Then the r.h.s. of (38) evaluated on e_i gives c_i , which can be of the form $(-1)^{Q(e_i)}$ only if $c_i \in \{\pm 1\}$. Perhaps surprisingly, it turns out that for some vector spaces S , one can represent non-trivial quadratic forms using complex phases c_i . Here is one example:

$$S = \left\{ s_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, s_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, s_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, s_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\} \subset \mathbb{F}_2^3,$$

and

$$c_1 = c_2 = i, \quad c_3 = -i.$$

Then $f : x \mapsto \prod_i c_i^{x_i}$ gives

$$f(s_0) = 1, \quad f(s_1) = -1, \quad f(s_2) = 1, \quad f(s_3) = 1.$$

One can easily check that f represents a quadratic form on S . Also, it is impossible to realize f by means of phases $c_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ (that is because any set of real phases would give rise to an even number of -1 's, whereas f is negative only once).

Hence sometimes it does pay off to leave the set of real phases in (38), even if one aims to represent a form which takes on values only in $\{\pm 1\}$. The preceding example is no threat to the LU-LC conjecture, as we only had to go to fourth roots of unity and $c_i \in \{\pm 1, \pm i\}$ still induce Clifford operations, as in this case the matrix

$$\bigotimes_i \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & c_i \end{bmatrix} \quad (41)$$

is still a local Clifford operation. The LU-LC conjecture amounts to claiming that it is never necessary to go to more general phases when representing quadratic forms over $\text{GF}(2)$ by way of (38).

Theorem 6. (Reduction to quadratic forms) *Let S be a linear subspace of $\mathbb{F}_2^n$, and let $Q : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$ be a quadratic function. Suppose that there exist complex phases $c_1, \dots, c_n$, (i.e. c_i is a complex number of modulus one) such that*

$$(-1)^{Q(x)} = \prod_{i=1}^n c_i^{x_i}, \quad \text{for every } x \in S. \quad (42)$$

If, for every such Q and S , the phases c_i can always be chosen from $\{\pm 1, \pm i\}$, then the LU-LC conjecture is true.

*Conversely, assume the LU-LC conjecture holds. Additionally, assume that if two stabilizer states can be mapped onto each other by means of a diagonal local unitary, then also by a **diagonal** local Clifford operation. Then the phases c_i introduced above can always be chosen from the set $\{\pm 1, \pm i\}$.*

Proof. Immediate from the preceding discussion. □

5 From stabilizer codes to stabilizer states

In this section, we prove that the LU-LC conjectures for stabilizer codes and stabilizer states are equivalent. Section 5.1 introduces some additional preliminary results regarding stabilizer codes. The proof is given in Section 5.2. The intuition

behind the argument is to assign to a code ρ on n qubits a *purification* $\sigma = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$; more concretely, we will extend the qubits $\{1, \dots, n\} =: A$ by auxiliary systems $\{n+1, \dots, n+l\} =: B$ and define a stabilizer state $|\Psi\rangle$ on the extended space (i.e., on $n+l$ qubits) in such a way that $\text{Tr}_B |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| = \rho$. For suitable choices of the purifications for the LU equivalent codes ρ and ρ' , we find that the LU equivalence of these codes implies the LU equivalence of their purifications. We then invoke the assumption that the LU-LC conjecture for stabilizer states is correct, implying that the purifications are actually LC equivalent. Finally, it is an easy step to prove that the LC equivalence of the purifications implies LC equivalence of the codes ρ and ρ' .

5.1 Preliminaries

An important feature of stabilizer states and codes is that they allow for an efficient description in terms of subspaces of the binary vector space $\mathbb{F}_2^{2n}$, as will be made explicit next. We refer to Refs. [1, 22, 11] for more details.

First, the connection between binary vector spaces and Pauli operators is provided by the map $\mathcal{W} : \mathbb{F}_2^{2n} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_n$ defined by

$$\mathcal{W}(z, x) = \bigotimes_{i=1}^n i^{z_i x_i} Z^{z_i} X^{x_i}, \quad (43)$$

where $z = (z_1, \dots, z_n)$, $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$. For a vector $v = (z, x) \in \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}$, we set $\mathcal{W}(v) := \mathcal{W}(z, x)$. Invoking (4), we have that $\mathcal{W}(t, 0) = Z(t)$ and $\mathcal{W}(0, t) = X(t)$, for every $t \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$.

It can be checked by direct computation that two Pauli operators $\mathcal{W}(z, x)$ and $\mathcal{W}(z', x')$ commute if and only if

$$\left[\begin{pmatrix} z \\ x \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} z' \\ x' \end{pmatrix} \right] := z^T x' + x^T z' = 0. \quad (44)$$

The square bracket will be referred to as the *symplectic inner product* of the binary vectors (z, x) and (z', x') .

We now consider a k -dimensional linear subspace M of $\mathbb{F}_2^{2n}$, where a basis $\{m^{(1)}, \dots, m^{(k)}\}$ has been chosen. We further assume that M is an *isotropic subspace*, i.e., the symplectic inner product between any two vectors in M vanishes. Lastly, we choose a vector $v = (v_1, \dots, v_k) \in \mathbb{F}_2^k$ and consider the set

$$\{(-1)^{v_1} \mathcal{W}(m^{(1)}), \dots, (-1)^{v_k} \mathcal{W}(m^{(k)})\}. \quad (45)$$

One can then verify that the multiplicative group $\mathcal{S}$ generated by the elements in the set (45) is a stabilizer of rank k . Conversely, it is well known that any stabilizer can be obtained by means of the above construction (see e.g. [22]).

The basis vectors $\{m^{(i)}\}$ of the k -dimensional isotropic subspace $M \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}$ are usually arranged as the columns of a $2n \times k$ matrix R over $\mathbb{F}_2$, which is said to be a *generator matrix* associated with the space M .

Next we state two lemmas that will be used below. To do this, we need some additional notations: let R be a generator matrix of a k -dimensional isotropic subspace $M \subseteq \mathbb{F}_2^{2n}$. Given a set of vectors $v_1, \dots, v_l$ in $\mathbb{F}_2^{2n}$, we denote by $[R, v_1, \dots, v_l]$ the $2n \times (k + l)$ matrix obtained by appending the vectors v_i as further columns to R (this notation involving square brackets is not to be confused with the notation for the symplectic inner product).

Qualitatively, the next lemma shows that one can complete any stabilizer group S to a maximal one of order 2^n by adding suitable “ Z -type” operators.

Lemma 6. *Let ρ be a stabilizer code on n qubits. Let S be its stabilizer, let R be an associated generator matrix, and let k be the rank of S . Then there exist vectors $z^{(1)}, \dots, z^{(n-k)} \in \mathbb{F}_2^n$ such that*

$$\left[R, \begin{pmatrix} z^{(1)} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \begin{pmatrix} z^{(n-k)} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \right] \quad (46)$$

is a generator matrix of a stabilizer state on n qubits.

Proof: Let R be a $2n \times k$ generator matrix of M . We can always choose R such that its lower $n \times k$ submatrix consists of k' linearly independent columns followed by $k - k'$ columns containing only zeros, for some $k' \leq k$. So

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} P_1 & P_2 \\ Q_1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (47)$$

where P_1 and Q_1 are $n \times k'$ matrices and P_2 has dimensions $n \times (k - k')$; also, Q_1 and P_2 have full rank. Consider the orthogonal complement of the column space of Q_1 , denoted in a shorthand notation by $\langle Q_1 \rangle^\perp$. This space has dimension $n - k'$ and contains the column space of P_2 as a $k - k'$ dimensional subspace; this follows from the property that M is isotropic. Hence, there exists an $n \times (n - k)$ matrix P_3 such that $[P_2 \ P_3]$ is an $n \times (n - k')$ generator matrix of $\langle Q_1 \rangle^\perp$. It then follows that

$$\begin{bmatrix} P_1 & P_2 & P_3 \\ Q_1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (48)$$

is a $2n \times n$ generator matrix of an n -dimensional isotropic space. This proves the result. $\square$

The following lemma is taken from the standard reference [22].

Lemma 7. [22] Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a stabilizer on n qubits generated by k independent elements $g_1, \dots, g_k$. Let i be any fixed number in the range $1, \dots, k$. Then there exists $g \in \mathcal{G}_n$ such that $gg_i = -g_i g$ and $gg_j = g_j g$ for every $j = 1, \dots, k, j \neq i$.

5.2 Reduction to stabilizer states

We proceed to the proof of Theorem 3. As stabilizer states are contained in the set of stabilizer codes, the non-trivial part of the theorem is: if the LU-LC conjecture is true for states, then also for codes. So for the rest of this section, we assume validity of the LU-LC conjecture for states.

First we look for a suitable purification of ρ . Let ρ be a rank k stabilizer code on n qubits with stabilizer $\mathcal{S}$, let $\{z^{(1)}, \dots, z^{(n-k)}\}$ be as in Lemma 6, and set $l := n - k$. For every $y \in \mathbb{F}_2^l$, let $\mathcal{S}_y$ be the stabilizer generated by the set of operators

$$\left\{ \mathcal{S}, (-1)^{y_1} Z(z^{(1)}), \dots, (-1)^{y_l} Z(z^{(l)}) \right\} \quad (49)$$

and let $|\psi_y\rangle$ be the stabilizer state on n qubits with stabilizer $\mathcal{S}_y$. The $(n + l)$ -qubit state

$$|\Psi\rangle := \sum_{y \in \mathbb{F}_2^l} |\psi_y\rangle \otimes |y\rangle \quad (50)$$

will be our candidate for a purification of the state ρ . Therefore, we need to prove that

- (i) $|\Psi\rangle$ is a stabilizer state, and
- (ii) the partial trace of $|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ over the qubits in $\{n + 1, \dots, n + l\}$ is equal to the state ρ .

These statements are proven next.

To prove (i), we will construct a maximal stabilizer on $n + l$ qubits having the state $|\Psi\rangle$ as a fixed point. First, let $\{g^{(1)}, \dots, g^{(k)}\}$ be a generating set of $\mathcal{S}$. It can then easily be verified that

$$g^{(i)} \otimes I_l |\Psi\rangle = |\Psi\rangle \quad (51)$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, k$. Second, for every $j = 1, \dots, l$, the calculation

$$\begin{aligned} Z(z^{(j)}, e^{(j)}) |\Psi\rangle &= \sum_y Z(z^{(j)}) |\psi_y\rangle \otimes Z(e^{(j)}) |y\rangle \\ &= \sum_y (-1)^{y_j} |\psi_y\rangle \otimes (-1)^{y_j} |y\rangle \\ &= |\Psi\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

shows that the operators $Z(z^{(j)}, e^{(j)})$ also fix the state $|\Psi\rangle$. Here, $e^{(j)}$ is the j th canonical basis vector of $\mathbb{F}_2^l$. Finally, it follows from Lemma 7 that there exist l Pauli operators $h^{(1)}, \dots, h^{(l)} \in \mathcal{G}_n$ such that

$$h^{(j)}|\psi_y\rangle = |\psi_{y+e^{(j)}}\rangle, \quad (53)$$

for every $j = 1, \dots, l$ and $y \in \mathbb{F}_2^l$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} h^{(j)} \otimes X(e^{(j)})|\Psi\rangle &= \sum_y h^{(j)}|\psi_y\rangle \otimes X(e^{(j)})|y\rangle \\ &= \sum_y |\psi_{y+e^{(j)}}\rangle \otimes |y+e^{(j)}\rangle = |\Psi\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

Thus, all $n + l$ operators in the set

$$\left\{ g^{(i)} \otimes I_l, Z(z^{(j)}, e^{(j)}), h^{(j)} \otimes X(e^{(j)}) \right\}_{i,j}, \quad (55)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $j = 1, \dots, l$, stabilize the state $|\Psi\rangle$. Moreover, these operators generate a rank $n + l$ stabilizer, showing that $|\Psi\rangle$ is indeed a stabilizer state.

We now prove (ii). The kets $|\psi_y\rangle$ form a basis within the range of ρ . To see this, recall that any two stabilizer states whose stabilizer operators differ only by global phases are orthogonal. Thus, $\{|\psi_y\rangle\}$ is a set of 2^{n-k} mutually orthogonal states, all of which are stabilized by any $g \in \mathcal{S}$. Further, all these states are eigenvectors of ρ with eigenvalue $|\mathcal{S}| = 2^{k-n}$. But the rank of ρ is equal to 2^{n-k} as well, and therefore

$$\rho = 2^{k-n} \sum_y |\psi_y\rangle \langle \psi_y|. \quad (56)$$

We are now in a position to prove the main result of this section. Let $\rho, U, \mathcal{S}, |\Psi\rangle$ and $\{|\psi_y\rangle\}$ be as above. By the same reasoning as the one employed in Section 3, there is no loss of generality in assuming that U is diagonal. Set $\rho' = U\rho U^\dagger$ and let $\mathcal{S}$ be the stabilizer of ρ' .

First we claim that $|\psi'_y\rangle := U|\psi_y\rangle$ is a stabilizer state, for each $y \in \mathbb{F}_2^l$. Indeed, it follows from $\rho|\psi_y\rangle = |\psi_y\rangle$ and the definition of ρ' that $|\psi'_y\rangle$ is an eigenvector of ρ' with eigenvalue 1, and hence of each $g' \in \mathcal{S}'$. Further, by construction, we have

$$Z(z^{(j)})|\psi_y\rangle = (-1)^{y_j}|\psi_y\rangle \quad (57)$$

and hence

$$UZ(z^{(j)})U^\dagger|\psi'_y\rangle = (-1)^{y_j}|\psi'_y\rangle, \quad (58)$$

for every $j = 1, \dots, l$. As U is diagonal, it commutes with $Z(z^{(j)})$, which finally implies that $|\psi'_y\rangle$ is an eigenvector of $Z(z^{(j)})$ with the eigenvalue $(-1)^{y_i}$. Define $\mathcal{S}'_y$ by substituting $\mathcal{S}$ by $\mathcal{S}'$ in (49). The group $\mathcal{S}'_y$ can be checked to be a stabilizer of rank n with $|\psi'_y\rangle$ as a common eigenvector. This shows that $|\psi'_y\rangle$ is a stabilizer state with stabilizer $\mathcal{S}_y$, for every $y \in \mathbb{F}_2^l$.

It now follows from an analogous argument as made in the beginning of this section that the state

$$|\Psi'\rangle := \sum_y |\psi'_y\rangle \otimes |y\rangle \quad (59)$$

is a stabilizer state on $n + l$ qubits such that ρ' is equal to the partial trace of this state over the qubits in the set $\{n + 1, \dots, n + l\}$. Furthermore, by definition of the states $|\psi'_y\rangle$ one has

$$(U \otimes I_l)|\Psi\rangle = |\Psi'\rangle, \quad (60)$$

i.e., the states $|\Psi'\rangle$ and $|\Psi\rangle$ are LU equivalent. Assuming validity of the LU-LC conjecture, there exists a LC operator on $n + l$ qubits relating these two states. Taking the partial trace over the qubits in the set $\{n + 1, \dots, n + l\}$ then shows that ρ and ρ' are LC equivalent. This proves Theorem 3.

6 Outlook

Unfortunately, even the strong reductions presented in this paper did not suffice to resolve the LU-LC conjecture. There are, however, further routes which may merit exploration. For example, we have indications for the fact that the phases c_i appearing in Theorem 2 may always be taken to be roots of unities (i.e. of the form $e^{i\pi\phi}$, for $\phi \in \mathbb{Q}$). This can be shown to imply that each c_i is a power of $e^{2\pi i/2^l}$ for some l and the LU-LC problem would reduce to a statement concerning the solutions of certain systems of linear equations in modules over the ring $\mathbb{Z}_{2^l}$. We did not make these arguments explicit, as even employing this additional structure, a general solution remains elusive.

7 Acknowledgements

DG is pleased to acknowledge the support of Jens Eisert during many stages of this project.

This work has been supported by the European Union (QICS, OLAQUI, SCALA, QAP, EURYI grant of J. Eisert), the FWF, and the EPSRC (IRC QIC).

References

- [1] D. Gottesman, PhD thesis, Caltech, 1997. e-print quant-ph/9705052.
- [2] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5188 (2001); Quant. Inf. Comp. **2**(6), 443 (2002).
- [3] R. Raussendorf, D. E. Browne and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 022312 (2003).
- [4] M. Hein *et al.*, Proceedings of the International School of Physics “Enrico Fermi” on “Quantum Computers, Algorithms and Chaos”, Varenna, Italy, July, 2005; see also quant-ph/0602096.
- [5] M. Hein, J. Eisert and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 062311 (2004).
- [6] W. Dür and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 180403 (2004).
- [7] D. Fattal, T. S. Cubitt, Y. Yamamoto, S. Bravyi and I. L. Chuang, quant-ph/0406168 (2004).
- [8] M. Van den Nest, J. Dehaene and B. De Moor, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 022316 (2004).
- [9] M. Van den Nest, J. Dehaene and B. De Moor, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 034302 (2004).
- [10] M. Hein, W. Dür and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 032350 (2005).
- [11] D. Gross, *Finite phase space methods in quantum information*, diploma thesis supervised by J. Eisert, University of Potsdam, 2005. Available online at <http://gross.qipc.org/>.
- [12] M. Van den Nest, J. Dehaene and B. De Moor, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 062323 (2005).
- [13] L. E. Danielsen, Master thesis, University of Bergen, quant-ph/0503236.
- [14] S. Bravyi, D. Fattal and D. Gottesman, J. Math. Phys. **47** 062106 (2006).
- [15] D. Gross, J. Math. Phys. **47**, 122107 (2006).
- [16] B. Zeng, H. Chung, A. W. Cross, and I. L. Chuang, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032325 (2007).
- [17] D. Gross, Appl. Phys. B **86**, 367 (2007).

- [18] D. Markham, A. Miyake, and S. Virmani, *New J. Phys.* **9**, 194 (2007).
- [19] D. Schlingemann, *Local equivalence of graph states*, in O. Krüger and R. F. Werner, quant-ph/0504166. See also <http://www.imaph.tu-bs.de/qi/problems/>.
- [20] M. Van den Nest, J. Dehaene and B. De Moor, Proceedings of the 16th international symposium on mathematical theory of networks and systems (MTNS), K.U. Leuven, Belgium (2004).
- [21] B. Zeng, A. Cross, I.L. Chuang, arXiv:0706.1382 (2007).
- [22] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- [23] E. Rains, *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, **1**, 266 (1999).
- [24] J. Dehaene and B. De Moor, *Phys. Rev. A*, **68**, 042318 (2003).